

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 3, 2006¹, the Examiner made the following objections and rejections:

- the specification was objected to for including a summary of the invention that is allegedly not commensurate with the claimed invention;
- the specification was also objected to for allegedly including an incorrect reference to a related application;
- the title of the invention was objected to for allegedly not being indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed;
- the Examiner apparently required a supplemental oath or declaration;
- the abstract was objected to allegedly because it does not reflect the claimed invention;
- claims 1, 25, 49, and 73 were objected to for allegedly being unclear; and
- claims 1-13, 16-37, 40-61, 64-85, and 88-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly not being patentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,381,628 to *Hunt* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,718 to *Blewett*.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the specification, including the summary of the invention section, the related application information section, and the abstract to address the Examiner's objections. In addition, Applicant has amended

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

independent claims 1, 25, 49, and 73 to clarify the recited subject matter. Claim 1 is also amended to correct a typographical error (a missing semicolon).

Claims 1-13, 16-37, 40-61, 64-85, and 88-96 are pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the remarks that follow.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for including an improper summary of the invention section, cross reference to related applications section and abstract. (Office Action, pp. 2-4.) Applicant has amended these sections to address the Examiner's concerns. (*See supra.*) In light of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the summary of the invention, the cross reference to related applications and the abstract.

The Examiner also objected to the title of the invention for not being clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. (Office Action, p. 3.) Applicant advises that the title of the invention is "Provision of Transparent Proxy Services to a User of a Client Device." In comparison, the preamble of independent claim 1 recites, "... providing transparent proxy services to a user of a client device...." Given the similarity between the title and the preamble of claim 1, Applicant submits that the title is sufficiently indicative of the subject matter recited in the claims. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the title. If the Examiner maintains this objection in the next Office Action, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and suggest a title that is more descriptive.

In addition, the Applicant notes that in the objection to the title, the Office Action states "Require a supplemental Oath or Declaration." (Office Action, p. 3.) Applicant, however, finds no basis for this requirement and respectfully declines to provide a supplemental Declaration.

Objections to Claims 1, 25, 49 and 73

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 25, 49, and 73 as being unclear for reciting "a first request," "a first unit," "a first reference," and "a first javascript function" without also reciting a respective "second" one on these limitations. Applicant disagrees. Generally, reciting a "first" element may imply a corresponding "second" element, however this recitation does not necessarily require a "second." Moreover, in this case, Applicant's recitation of "a first" in independent claims 1, 25, 49, and 73 renders the subsequent dependent claims, which recite "a second," more clear. Applicant, therefore, requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 1, 25, 29, and 73.

Rejection of Claims 1-13, 16-37, 40-61, 64-85, and 88-96

The Examiner rejected the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hunt* in view of *Blewett*. (Office Action, p. 4.) Applicant traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (8th ed., revised 2005). Claim 1 is allowable because the references applied in the Office Action fail in at least this regard.

Hunt is directed to a distributed processing system in which various components of a software application are accessed from a plurality of remote computers. (See, e.g., col. 6:38-53.) The system provides a local client 100 that instantiates and accesses the services of a remote component 140 and, when the component 140 is activated on a computer 5, client 100 receives an interface pointer to an interface proxy 110 for the respective component 140. (Cols. 11:57-12:3.) Consequently, component 140 may be instantiated on the remote computer by referencing local address space in the client 100. (Col. 12:10-16.) The location of the component 140 is transparent to the client 100 because, whether instantiated locally or remotely, the client 100 still invokes the component by calling the component 140 indirectly in the client. (Cols. 12:19-27, 13:20-25.)

Hunt, however, does not teach or suggest “the proxy server receiving the first unit of digital content from the remote server” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. The Examiner apparently alleges that proxy server 55 and remote component 140 correspond to the claimed “proxy server” and “unit of digital content.” (*Hunt*, p. 5:1-7.)² Applicant respectfully disagrees. Client 100 of the reference invokes remote component 140 at a remote computer system 5 through an indirect call on an interface virtual function table 64 belonging to a proxy 100. (Cols. 12:2-3 and 12:63-13:9.) Proxy 110 of the reference merely marshals arguments included in the indirect call into packets and sends the packets to the destination computer 5. Because remote component 140 is

² The Examiner alleges that *Hunt* discloses “the first web page from the remote server.” (Office Action, p. 6-7, citing *Hunt*, Col. 7:25.) Applicant notes that *Hunt* does not recite a “web page” as alleged by the Examiner. The cited portion merely appears to disclose various types of networks.

invoked at remote computer system 5, proxy server 55 never receives remote component 140 in the system of *Hunt*. Accordingly, *Hunt* fails to teach or suggest, at least, “receiving a first unit of digital content” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, because proxy server 55 of the reference does not receive remote component 140, proxy server 55 cannot teach or suggest the other limitations performed by the claimed “proxy server.” For instance, without ever having received remote component 140, *Hunt* cannot teach or suggest “the proxy server parsing the first unit of digital content for references to the remote server.”

Moreover, the parsing performed by *Hunt* does not describe “parsing the first unit of digital content for references to the remote server,” as claim 1 recites. The Examiner alleges that *Hunt*’s disclosure of “return an interface pointer to an interface proxy, parse information” teaches this limitation. (Office Action, p. 5:8-10, citing *Hunt*, col. 12:1-40.) However, the only parsing disclosed in *Hunt* is proxy 110’s marshaling of function arguments from client 100 into packets that can be transported between address spaces or between machines. (Col. 12:44-48.) Nowhere does *Hunt* disclose or suggest proxy server 55 of *Hunt*’s system parsing remote component 140 for references to remote computer system 5 and, therefore, *Hunt* cannot teach or suggest “parsing the first unit of digital content for references to the remote server” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, *Hunt* does not to teach or suggest “the proxy server identifying a first reference within a software construct, wherein the software construct, when performed, would force a page reload by a browser” (emphasis added), as claimed. Apparently, the Examiner alleges teaching that a “rewriter inserts an entry to load [a

DLL” (Office Action, p. 5:10-12, citing *Hunt* Col. 44:48-67) describes this limitation. To the contrary, *Hunt* merely inserts a DLL into an application that causes other DLLs to be loaded. (*Hunt* Col. 44:48-55.) *Hunt*, however, is silent with regard to “identifying a first reference within a software construct,” as well as “forc[ing] a page reload by a browser,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, *Hunt* fails to teach or suggest these limitations, as well.

Blewett does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of *Hunt*. The Examiner relies on *Blewett* to support the allegation that “it is well known in the art that a proxy service will remove or rewrite the host name (address, URL).” (Office Action, p. 6:10-13.) However, *Blewett*, taken alone or in combination with the teachings of *Hunt*, fails to teach or suggest, at least, “the proxy server identifying a first reference within a software construct, wherein the software construct, when performed, would force a page reload by the browser; the proxy server inserting a first software function into the modified remote page for modifying references; [and] the proxy server inserting a call to the first software function into the software construct, wherein the first reference is encapsulated in the function call,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, *Hunt* and *Blewett*, taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claim 1 is allowable over the applied references. Independent claims 25, 49, and 73 recite limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable over *Hunt* and *Blewett* for reasons analogous to those provided with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, dependent

claims 2-13, 16-24, 26-37, 40-48, 50-61, 64-72, 74-85, and 88-96 are also allowable at least due to their corresponding dependence from claims 1, 25, 49, or 73.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are not rendered obvious in view of the references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 5, 2007

By: 

Steven L. Ashburn
Reg. No. 56,636

Enclosures:

Replacement Abstract (1 page)